



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

H

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,418	01/05/2001	Jorge M. Ferreira	60001.0009US01	4805
27488	7590	01/25/2008	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			PAULA, CESAR B	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			2178	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/755,418	FERREIRA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
CESAR B. PAULA	2178		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3,5,7-12,14,16-20 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 3, 5, 7-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 14367
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 10/30/2007.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claim 30 has been added. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12, 14, 16-20, 27-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Star Office 5.1 Memorandum, and figs (published before 1/5/2001), from IDS submitted on 2/10/2005, hereinafter Staroffice, in view of Keene et al, hereinafter Keene (USPub.# 2004/0049294 A1, 3/11/2004, continuation filed on 9/23/1999), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 1/5/2001 have been approved by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12, 14, 16-20, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Star Office 5.1 Memorandum, and figs (published before 1/5/2001), from IDS submitted on 2/10/2005, hereinafter Staroffice, in view of Keene et al, hereinafter Keene (USPub.# 2004/0049294 A1, 3/11/2004, continuation filed on 9/23/1999), further in view of the instant specification.

Regarding independent claim 1, Staroffice teaches software comment box for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*activating a privacy option comprising computer-implemented instructions provided by the document-generating application*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file. The comment box is displayed superimposed within the document. The author’s name is replaced—*enable removal*-- with more generic information, such as date and time of creation/modification—*replacing the one or more pieces of personal information created by the document-generating application with generic information visible at each comment block of the first document* (memorandum, shots 1-2). Only the properties of the file are edited, and not the body of the document-- *removing from all portions of the first document except for a body of the first document one or more pieces of information of the personal information without deleting the first document*. Staroffice fails to explicitly teach *saving the first document with the generic information replacing the removed personal information, wherein saving the first document further comprises, in response to activating the privacy option, replacing the removed personal information with the generic information in both a memory representation of the first*

document and a file representation of the first document. Keene teaches the blocking or removing of data from a document deemed sensitive by a user. The data is sent as a redacted file to a requestor of information, only blocking the data the user is not privileged to see (0007,0047, 0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Staroffice, and Keene, because of all the reasons found in Keene including maintaining trade secrets, and confidentiality among business partners, and allowing access to information in an organized and useful manner (005-0006).

Moreover, Staroffice fails to explicitly teach *the one or more pieces of the personal information being requested by the document-generating application during installation of the document-generating application.* Keene teaches the blocking or removing of data from a document deemed sensitive by a user. The data is sent as a redacted file to a requestor of information, only blocking the data the user is not privileged to see (0007,0047, 0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Staroffice, and Keene to remove sensitive information, such as well-known information requested from user during the installation of the application (instant specification pages 1-2), because of all the reasons found in Keene including maintaining trade secrets, and confidentiality among business partners, and allowing access to information in an organized and useful manner (005-0006).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document--*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name-- *generic information made up of string of letters--* from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document removes one or more pieces of personal information from the first document when the first document is saved--*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Staroffice teaches replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, in a comment box, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2). In other words, the same document—*template--* is used to replace the updated information thereby creating a new or second document containing the updated information.

Claim 9 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 10 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for executing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 11, Staroffice teaches the default selection of a “Apply user data” checkbox, in a comment box displayed superimposed on a document, enabling the display of an author’s name —*receiving input of one or more pieces of personal information into one or more data storage fields in response to a request for personal information from a document-generating application*—. Software dialog comment box is used for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*activate a computer-implemented privacy option*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author’s name, from the properties of a file as displayed in the comment box. The author’s name is replaced—*removal*— with more generic information, such as date and time of creation/modification—*replacing the removed personal information with generic information visible within the comment within the document* (memorandum, shots 1-2)—*removes the one or more pieces of information of the personal information from the document without deleting the document*. Staroffice fails to explicitly teach *request for personal information from the document generating program during installation of the document-generating program; receiving input by the document-generating program to save the document, wherein saving the document removes the one or more pieces of personal information from the document and the comment visible within block of the document or replacing replaces the one or more pieces of personal information with generic information in the document and the comment box visible within block of the document in both a memory representation of the document and a file representation of the document*.

Keene teaches the blocking or removing of data from a document deemed sensitive by a user. The data is placed in a redacted file and sent to a requestor of information (0007,0047, 0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Staroffice, and Keene to remove sensitive information, such as well-known information requested from user during the installation of the application (instant specification pages 1-2), because of all the reasons found in Keene including maintaining trade secrets, and confidentiality among business partners, and allowing access to information in an organized and useful manner (005-0006).

Claims 12, 14, and 16 are directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claims 3, 5, and 1 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 17 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 11, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 18-20 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for executing the steps found in claims 11, and 1-2 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 1, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox in a dialog box, and clicking Ok for changing—*activating the privacy option enables removal of personal information from the comment box*

without removing the comment-- and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file, which are displayed in a dialog box—comment box—along with a document (memorandum, shots 1-2). Only the properties of the file are edited, and not the body of the document --removes the personal information from the document without deleting the document.

Regarding claims 28-29, which depends on claims 1, and 19, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an “Apply user data” checkbox in a dialog box, and clicking Ok for changing and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file, which are displayed in a dialog box—comment box—along with a document (memorandum, shots 1-2). Staroffice fails to explicitly teach *replacing the removed personal information with the generic information in both a memory representation of the first document and a file representation of the first document comprises maintaining content corresponding to the personal information in a text portion in both the memory representation of the first document and the file representation of the first document.* Keene teaches the blocking, and masking of data from a document deemed sensitive by a user. The masked data is placed in a redacted file and sent to a requestor of information to whom it is displayed (0007,0047, 0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Staroffice, and Keene, because of all the reasons found in Keene including maintaining trade secrets, and confidentiality among business partners, and allowing access to information in an organized and useful manner (005-0006).

Claim 30 is directed towards a method similar to the steps found in claims 3, 5 and 7, except for *wherein replacing the removed personal information with the generic information in both a memory representation of the first document and a file representation of the first document comprises maintaining content corresponding to the personal information in a text portion in both the memory representation of the first document and the file representation of the first document*, which is taught by Staroffice' software for deselecting an "Apply user data" checkbox in a dialog box, and clicking Ok for changing and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file, which are displayed in a dialog box—*comment box*—along with a document (memorandum, shots 1-2). The document data related to the personal data remains and is not deleted by the option selection, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/30/2007 have been considered but are not persuasive. The Applicants remark that Staroffice fails to teach or suggest *"activating a privacy option comprising computer- implemented instructions provided by the document-generating application and removing from all portions of the first document except for a body of the first document one or more pieces of the personal information without deleting the first document, the one or more pieces of the personal information being requested by the document- generating application during installation of the document-generating application."* (page 12). The Examiner disagrees, because Staroffice teaches the replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file, and not the body of the document. The

comment box is displayed superimposed within the document. The author's name is replaced with more generic information, such as date and time of creation/modification (memorandum, shots 1-2). In other words, the personal information is removed without having to delete the entire document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Staroffice, and Keene to remove sensitive information, such as well-known information requested from user during the installation of the application (instant specification pages 1-2), because of all the reasons found in Keene including maintaining trade secrets, and confidentiality among business partners, and allowing access to information in an organized and useful manner (005-0006).

The Applicant is directed towards the rejection of newly added claim 30 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(571)-273-8300** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)



CESARIO PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1/22/2008